

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/079,640

Applicant(s)

Daniel

Examiner

FOX

Group Art Unit

1638

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Stephanie W. Young (48,052)

(3) _____

(2) Guy Donatello (33,167)

(4) _____

Date of Interview

9/6/01

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed:

All

Identification of prior art discussed:

of record

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Filed draft of proposed amendments discussed. Examiner indicated that amendments would overcome errors + 112 2nd for all and art rejections (of claims 198-199 only). Appl rep indicated intent to submit a later filed publication showing that Zoubenko vector was used to transform potato \Rightarrow claim 2 to be withdrawn. Appl rep urged that Zoubenko found another transcriptionally (silent) intergenic conserved region \Rightarrow 112 1st improper. Appl rep to provide evidence of the existence of other conserved intergenic

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

regions. Examiner indicated that this evidence should be accompanied with declaration arguments that the other transcriptionally silent or active conserved intergenic regions were obtained or obtainable by the methods outlined in instant spec. If claims are to be limited to transcriptionally active vs. silent regions, this presents another obstacle to be addressed.